



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,321	04/19/2004	Craig A. Branch	026746.101-US01	1066
26853 7590 03/02/2007 COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2401			EXAMINER LAMPRECHT, JOEL	
			ART UNIT 3737	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,321

Applicant(s)

BRANCH ET AL.

Examiner

Joel M. Lamprecht

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/19/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/19/04, 6/7/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/826,260. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 29 of copending Application No. 09/985473. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ

619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 96, 7, 12, 16, are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-6 of copending Application 10/826,260. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they constitute obvious alternate variations and groupings. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 2-28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-60 of copending Application 09/985,473. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they constitute obvious alternate variations and groupings. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3737

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoult et al. '278 (US Patent 5,735,278). Hoult et al. teach a system for providing RF shielding comprising: a holder or canopy comprising holder-RF shielding (see Col 10, Line 15-50). Element 72 discloses a protective covering and layer 71 of Figure 8 discloses a magnet comprising magnet-RF-shielding (Col 10 Line 15-24, and also Col 10 Line 36-44). The combination of the holder-RF-shielding and the magnet-RF-shielding to form a substantially complete RF shield. The entirety of the holder comprises RF shielding and therefore inherently the bottom and canopy would comprise RF shielding.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoult et al.'278 (US Patent No. 5,735,278) in view of Palkovich et al.'217 (US Patent No. 5,012,217). Hoult et al.'278 teach a system for providing RF shielding comprising: a holder or canopy comprising holder-RF-shielding (see col. 10, lines 15-50; and particularly referring to element 72 or electrically conductive fabric bag; note that as evidenced by the Merriam-Webster definitions a canopy is a protective covering); and a magnet comprising magnet-RF-

Art Unit: 3737

shielding (see layer 71 of Figure 8 which is the magnet RF shielding and see col. 10, lines 15-24) and also see col. 10, lines 36-44; referring to the combining of the holder-RF-shielding and the magnet-RF-shielding to form a substantially complete RF shield. The whole holder includes RF shielding and therefore inherently any of its sub-parts such as the bottom portion would necessarily include RF shielding. Hoult et al. '278 does not explicitly teach that the magnet itself comprises RF shielding, meaning that there is no explicit recitation that the magnet has sufficient RF shielding in that it is a superconducting magnet with an inner diameter having a cryostat made of radio-opaque material. In the same field of endeavor, Palkovich et al. '217 teaches the magnet itself comprises RF shielding, meaning that the magnet has sufficient RF shielding in that it is a superconducting magnet with an inner diameter having a cryostat made of radio-opaque material (see col. 6, lines 4-12 and col. 6, lines 53-61; wherein iron is radio-opaque). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have modified Hoult et al. '278 and incorporated the teaching of Palkovich et al. '217 of using his particular magnet arrangement with the cryostat in order to increase the RF shielding of the system (see col. 6, lines 53-61 indicating a four-fold increase of the shielding factor).

5. Hoult et al. '278 teach the locomotion of a patient into the imaging volume as indicated in figure 8 having wheels or rollers as indicated. Hoult et al. '278 further teach the use of an RF antenna on the patient support unit as indicated by element 18 in Figure 8 (also see col. 5, lines 20-22).

The opening of the canopy is interpreted as the aperture, which connects the two parts of shielding, the holder and the magnet.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joel M. Lamprecht whose telephone number is (571) 272-3250. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JML
2/19/07


EION MANTIS McLEOD
SPE 3768